TEAMS CONTRACT NNL07AA00B
(Source Selection Statement)

The deleted material is exempt from disclosure under 14 C.F.R. 1206.300(b)(4) which covers trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged and confidential information. It has been held that commercial or financial material is "confidential" for purposes of this exemption if its disclosure would be likely to have either of the following effects: (1) impair the Government's ability to obtain necessary information in the future; or (2) cause substantial harm to the competitive position of the person from whom the information was obtained, National Parks and Conservation v. Morton, 498 F2d 765 (D.C. Cir. 1974).

Source Selection Statement for the

Technology, Engineering, and Aerospace Mission Support (TEAMS) Contract

(NASA Solicitation Number NNL06148457R)

Source Selection Information (until contract award)

See FAR 3.104

Table of Contents

Source Selection Statement
for the
Technology, Engineering, and Aerospace Mission Support (TEAMS) Contract
(NASA Solicitation Number NNL06148457R)

I. Identification of the Acquisition

The Technology, Engineering, and Aerospace Mission Support (TEAMS) contract will serve as the primary Research and Technology (R&T) support contract on-site at the NASA Langley Research Center (LaRC). The TEAMS effort includes, but is not limited to, the following research, engineering and technical support activities: a) Development of computational and experimental aerodynamic databases; b) Structural testing, analysis, and interpretation of data; c) Modernization of the National Airspace System; d) Flight deck design guidelines; e) Systems analysis and conceptual; design of aerospace vehicles; f) Provide mission architectures; g) Engineering design of system components; h) Mission requirements development; and i) Independent safety analysis and assessment for the Agency.

II. Background

The TEAMS procurement will result in the award of a single Indefinite-Delivery/Indefinite Quantity (IDIQ) contract. Task Orders issued will be cost-plus-award-fee or firm-fixed-price. The period of performance will be 60 months inclusive of a 45-day phase-in period. The guaranteed minimum for the contract is $1M. The maximum value is $200M for the 60 month period of performance. This procurement was conducted as a small business set-aside.

The TEAMS contract consolidates the services provided under six current or recently ended support service contracts and five Blanket Purchase Agreements (BPAs). In accordance with Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) 2.101, bundling requirements do not apply because this acquisition is suitable for award to a small business concern.

The incumbent contractors (and contract numbers) for the six contracts that will be consolidated in their entirety on commencement of the TEAMS contract are as follows:

	Contract Number	Contractor Name	Title of Contract
Single Award	NAS1-00135	Swales and Associates, Inc.	Systems Analysis and Mission Support
Multiple Award	NAS1-00140	Ball Aerospace & Technologies Corporation	Space Technology Research and Development
	NAS1-00141	Lockheed Martin Corporation	Space Technology Research and Development
	NAS1-00142	Swales and Associates, Inc.	Space Technology Research and Development
Multiple Award	NAS1-02056	Georgia Tech Applied Research Corporation	Electromagnetic Systems
	NAS1-02057	Research Triangle Institute	Electromagnetic Systems

The five BPAs that will be consolidated throughout the life of the TEAMS contract are as follows:

BPA Number	Contractor Name	Title of BPA
NNL04AA03Z	Analytical Mechanics Associates	Engineering Support for Aerospace Systems Concepts and Analysis Competency
L71395D	General Dynamics Advanced Information Systems	Non-linear Mechanics Technology Development
NNL04AA07Z	General Dynamics Advanced Information Systems	Engineering and Technician Support for Impact Dynamics Design, Fabrication and Analysis
L71753D	Analytical Services and Materials, Inc.	Development of Coatings for Environmental and Protection and Thermal Control for Aerospace Vehicles
NNL04AA04Z	Science and Technology Corporation	Services for R&D of Quantum Computing, Quantum Apertures and Advanced Thermoelectric Materials

III. Evaluation Factors and Subfactors

The RFP set forth the following three evaluation factors:

Factor 1 – Mission Suitability
Factor 2 – Cost/Price Analysis
Factor 3 – Past Performance

The RFP stated that in the overall selection of a contractor for award, that Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance would be of essentially equal importance; and that Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, would be significantly more important than Cost.

A. Factor 1 – Mission Suitability

The following Mission Suitability Subfactors were established, with weights assigned as indicated below, using a 1,000-point scale:

Subfactor 1	Understanding the Requirements and Technical Approach	400
Subfactor 2	Management and Staffing	400
Subfactor 3	Phase-In Plan	100
Subfactor 4	Safety, Health, and Security	100

The Source Evaluation Board (SEB) used the following adjectival scoring and percentage scores for the Mission Suitability factor as required by the NASA FAR Supplement (NFS) 1815.305(a)(3)(A) to assign adjective ratings and percentage scores for each Subfactor within Mission Suitability and for the overall Mission Suitability factor:

RANGE	ADJECTIVAL RATING DEFINITIONS
Excellent 91–100	A comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with one or more significant strengths. No deficiency or significant weakness exists.
Very Good 71–90	A proposal having no deficiency and which demonstrates overall competence. One or more significant strengths have been found, and strengths outbalance any weaknesses that exist.
Good 51–70	A proposal having no deficiency and which shows a reasonably sound response. There may be strengths or weaknesses, or both. As a whole, weaknesses not offset by strengths do not significantly detract from the Offeror's response.
Fair 31–50	A proposal having no deficiency and which has one or more weaknesses. Weaknesses outbalance any strengths.
Poor 0–30	A proposal that has one or more deficiencies or significant weaknesses that demonstrate a lack of overall competence or would require a major proposal revision to correct.

B. Factor 2 – Cost/Price Analysis

The RFP does not provide for adjectival ratings or numerical scores under the Cost/Price Analysis factor. The Cost/Price evaluation language from Section M-4, "Factor 2 – Cost/Price Analysis" of the RFP follows:

> "NASA will conduct an analysis of the proposed cost to determine its reasonableness, acceptability and extent to which it reflects performance addressed in the technical proposal. In addition, NASA will perform an in-depth analysis of the proposed cost elements and fee to assess cost realism and the Offeror's capability to accomplish the contract objectives within the cost proposed. NASA will develop a probable cost that factors in NASA's technical evaluation and consideration for purposes of determining best value."

The cost/price proposal also was used as an aid to determine the Offeror's understanding of Mission Suitability Requirements. In accordance with Section M-7, "Cost Realism Adjustment", the Mission Suitability score may be adjusted to account for any weaknesses associated with the lack of cost realism present in the Offeror's proposal.

C. Factor 3 – Past Performance

The SEB rated the Past Performance factor in accordance with the adjectival rating scale shown below, which is set forth in Section M-5, "Factor 3 – Past Performance" of the RFP. Each of the Past Performance adjective ratings has a "performance" component and a "relevance" component. The Offeror must meet the requirements of both components to achieve a particular rating.

RATING	ADJECTIVAL RATING DEFINITIONS
Excellent	Of exceptional merit; **exemplary performance** in a timely, efficient, and economical manner; very minor (if any) deficiencies with no adverse effect on overall performance; and experience that is **highly relevant** to this procurement.
Very Good	**Very effective performance**; fully responsive to contract requirements; contract requirements accomplished in a timely, efficient, and economical manner for the most part, only minor deficiencies with minimal effect on overall performance; and experience is **very relevant** to this procurement.
Good	**Effective performance**; fully responsive to contract requirements; reportable deficiencies, but with little identifiable effect on overall performance; and experience is **relevant** to this procurement.
Satisfactory	Meets or slightly exceeds minimum acceptable standards; adequate results; reportable deficiencies with identifiable, but not substantial, effects on overall performance; and experience is at least **somewhat relevant** to this procurement.
Poor/ Unsatisfactory	Does not meet minimum acceptable standards in one or more areas; remedial action required in one or more areas; deficiencies in one or more areas which adversely affect overall performance.
Neutral	No record of relevant past performance or past performance information is not available.

IV. Sources

The TEAMS Draft Request for Proposal (DRFP) was released on May 22, 2006 for industry comment. Following the release of the DRFP, the SEB conducted a Pre-Solicitation Conference at Langley Research Center on June 1, 2006. 52 individuals representing 28 different companies attended the conference. The final RFP was released on June 21, 2006 via the NASA Acquisition Information System (NAIS) and Federal Business Opportunities (FedBizOpps). Past Performance Proposals (Volume III) was due on July 21, 2006 for early evaluation. The Mission Suitability Proposals (Technical-Volume I) and the Cost Proposals (Business-Volume II) were due on July 31, 2006.

Proposals were received from the following four offerors (listed in alphabetical order):

1. Prime Contractor: Analytical Services & Materials, Inc. (AS&M)
   Team Members: [redacted]

2. Prime Contractor: ASRC Aerospace, Inc. (ASRCA)
   Team Members: [redacted]

3. Prime Contractor: QSS Group, Inc. (QSS)
   Team Members: [redacted]

4. Prime Contractor: Swales Aerospace (Swales)
   Team Members: [redacted]

V. Evaluation Procedures

An SEB was appointed to develop the RFP and to conduct the evaluation of proposals received in response to the RFP. As required in paragraph (a) of RFP Section M-2, "Method of Evaluation", the SEB conducted its evaluation in accordance with NFS 1815.3, using the evaluation criteria defined in the RFP and described above. These procedures and criteria were followed throughout the evaluation process.

The evaluation was performed by the SEB using the evaluation criteria set forth in Section M of the RFP; the evaluation numerical and adjectival rating and scoring system in NFS 1815.305(a)(3)(A) for Mission Suitability and Past Performance; Section M–4, "Factor 2 – Cost/Price Analysis"; and the Mission Suitability Cost Realism Adjustment Table, Section M–7, "Cost Realism Adjustment". The SEB members and all consultants

are NASA LaRC civil service employees. The evaluation was performed by the SEB, supplemented by a Past Performance Committee (PPC) established to serve as a fact-finding arm of the SEB. The PPC examined in detail Volume III, Past Performance, for each proposal, as well as conducted a thorough review of the Past Performance Questionnaires (PPQs) received from customers of the Offerors and their subcontractors. The PPC also made extensive use of all available sources [e.g., NASA Past Performance Data Base (PPDB), Contractor Performance Assessment Reporting System (CPARS), Past Performance Information Retrieval System (PPIRS)] of past performance reports from various agencies. The PPC followed up on any negative past performance issues identified by customers. In many instances, the review of a PPQ was followed up with a telephone call to a customer point of contact to clarify information already provided. In accordance with FAR 15.306(a)(2), the PPC prepared clarification questions for each Offeror in each instance where negative past performance was reported, and the Offeror had not previously had an opportunity to respond. The PPC reported the results of its work to the SEB on September 27, 2006. Other consultants were used to assist the SEB in performing the evaluation of specific aspects of the proposals: Representative Task Orders, Quality Management System, Safety and Health Plan, Information Technology (IT) Security, and Export Control.

The evaluation began with the SEB conducting an initial review of each Technical Proposal (Volume I) and the Cost/Price Analyst reviewing the Cost Proposal (Volume II) in sufficient depth to identify any proposal(s) that were unacceptable, in accordance with NFS 1815.305-70. The SEB convened and discussed the results of the initial review. The consensus of the SEB was that none of the four proposals were found to be patently unacceptable, thus all warranted full evaluation.

The SEB members then independently reviewed each Technical Proposal (in alphabetical order), and documented strengths and weaknesses under the various Mission Suitability Subfactors. The SEB consultants also independently reviewed specific areas of the Technical Proposal for which they possessed subject matter expertise. After completion of each individual evaluation, the SEB met and discussed their individual findings as well as the recommendations of the consultants, and developed consensus strengths and weaknesses for each individual Offeror. Following the evaluation of each Offeror's technical proposal, the SEB revisited, in caucus, all Mission Suitability findings, and performed a crosswalk to confirm that all proposals were evaluated objectively and consistently.

Once this phase of the evaluation was concluded, the SEB members independently reviewed each Past Performance Proposal (Volume III) and all of the PPQs and other information obtained from past performance reports. After the PPC reported the results of its work to the SEB, the SEB considered the PPC's report as well as its own findings to develop consensus findings for the past performance factor for both the "performance" and the "relevance" component. When this was complete, the SEB then developed a consensus rating for each Offeror using the adjectival rating scale set forth in Section M–5, "Factor 3 – Past Performance" of the RFP.

Next, the SEB reviewed each cost proposal to determine the extent to which it reflects performance addressed in the Offerors' technical proposal and the Offerors' capability to accomplish the contract objectives within its proposed cost. The SEB reviewed the cost proposals and addressed any inconsistencies between each Offeror's cost and technical proposal. The SEB provided the results of its review to the NASA Cost/Price Analyst who incorporated the results, along with information from Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) offices, into the detailed analysis of the individual cost proposals. The Pricing Report shows the determination of price reasonableness and a summary of the cost realism analysis, and relies upon the individual proposals, the analysis of these proposals, and SEB and DCAA input. Pursuant to NFS 1815.305(a)(1)(B)(c), as part of performing the cost realism analyses, a level of confidence was determined for the probable cost assessment for each proposal. Probable cost confidence is the degree to which the probable costs can be relied upon to ascertain the likely cost of performance for each Offeror. Upon finalizing the probable cost assessment, the SEB determined whether cost realism adjustments were necessary in accordance with Section M–7, "Cost Realism Adjustment" of the RFP.

Throughout the SEB's review of Mission Suitability, the SEB consulted with the Contracting Officer (CO) to review the SEB's findings. The SEB then developed its consensus adjectival ratings and point scores for each Mission Suitability Subfactor, and for the Mission Suitability Factor as a whole. The CO and the SEB then conducted a similar review for the Past Performance and Cost/Price factors. The SEB then developed its consensus adjectival ratings for Past Performance to conclude the proposal evaluation process.

VI. Summary of Findings

The results of the initial evaluations were reviewed by the CO and were discussed between the CO and the SEB. The RFP stated the Government's intent to award a contract without discussions. The CO's initial evaluation concluded that award could be made without discussions. The SEB, therefore, proceeded directly with a formal presentation of its findings to me on October 23, 2006. The SEB's presentation included procurement background information, evaluation procedures, and the results of the proposal evaluations. I carefully reviewed the SEB's findings and discussed those findings with the SEB. I requested that the CO conduct additional research to determine if award could be made without discussions, and to report back with a final determination. I did not direct a competitive range to be determined or make a selection decision. The CO determined that there was an error in the RFP concerning the requirement for an IT Security Plan. The CO determined that it is not possible for Offerors to complete an IT Security Plan that fulfills the requirements of NPR 2810.1A and LAPD 2810.1 prior to start of performance of a contract. The RFP in Section L–18, "Volume 1 – Technical Proposal: Factor 1 – Mission Suitability, Subfactor 4 – Safety, Health, and Security", however, required the submission of an IT Security Plan with the Offeror's proposal and intended to incorporate that IT Security Plan into the resulting contract award. To correct this error, it was necessary to amend the RFP requirements

to change the Section L–18 to require submission of an IT Security Approach and to require submission of an IT Security Plan within 60 days after contract award. The CO briefed me on the proposed amendment and I concurred with its issuance. After fully evaluating the Offeror's responses to the amendment, the SEB presented to me a final and integrated evaluation of the proposals on November 13, 2006. After discussing the evaluation with the SEB and reviewing its findings, I concur with the CO's determination that discussions are not necessary.

I concur with the SEB findings as presented below:

The following chart illustrates the top-level summary of the details that were provided, discussed, and included within the SEB's written report:

Offeror	Mission Suitability Rating	Evaluated Price (Probable Cost)	Past Performance Rating
AS&M	Good	[redacted]	Good
ASRCA	Good	[redacted]	Good
QSS	Good	[redacted]	Good
Swales	Very Good	[redacted]	Excellent
Government Estimate		[redacted]	

The following is a summary of the most significant evaluation findings:

A. FACTOR 1: MISSION SUITABILITY

The Factor 1 Mission Suitability findings are the result of evaluating the Offeror's proposal against Section M, "Evaluation Factors for Award to Offerors" of the RFP. The specific criteria of Section M–3, "Factor 1 – Mission Suitability" that each finding relates to have been underlined to allow correlation between the findings and the evaluation factor.

Set forth in alphabetical order is a summary of the Mission Suitability findings for the four Offerors. All significant strengths listed below are considered to be of substantial value to the Government, and all significant weaknesses listed below are considered to appreciably increase the risk of unsuccessful contract performance. In addition, I gave careful consideration to all of the strengths and weaknesses included within the SEB findings.

1. AS&M

AS&M received a **Good** rating at the Mission Suitability factor level for a proposal which shows a reasonably sound response and contains numerous significant strengths, no significant weakness, and no deficiencies. The findings for AS&M are summarized below by Mission Suitability Subfactor.

Subfactor 1, "Understanding the Requirements and Technical Approach" – AS&M received a **Good** rating for a proposal which shows a reasonably sound response and has no significant strength, deficiency or significant weakness.

Subfactor 2, "Management and Staffing" – AS&M received a **Very Good** rating for a proposal which demonstrates overall competence with several significant strengths, no deficiency, and no significant weakness.

Significant Strengths:

- MAS1, "Management Approach" – The Offeror presented a comprehensive approach to the day-to-day management of the total contract as well as the individual Task Orders. The Offeror's Task Order management approach was based on a planning process that provides for early identification and resolution of issues and defined processes to enhance quality and timeliness. The Offeror's approach for managing the extensive range of services delineated in the PWS includes dividing the work [redacted] This integrated process will result in effective management of the extensive range of services delivered throughout the life cycle of the Task Orders.

- MAS4, "Teaming Arrangements" – The Offeror proposed a suitable and effective teaming arrangement for accomplishing the PWS and Task Order requirements. The Offeror presented an integrated team whereby the plan for distributing the work amongst the team members assures that all PWS areas of work are covered by at least [redacted] team members. The work distribution provides depth and redundancy of skill-sets and expertise. The Prime Contractor will perform the majority percentage of work. Additionally to augment the accessibility of skill sets and to accomplish all contract requirements, the Offeror will utilize internal corporate reach-back resources as well as external specialty subcontractors.

- MAS6, "Continuing Personnel Management" – The Offeror presented a comprehensive approach which included maintaining a competent staff over the life of the contract by providing competitive total compensation plans, employee retention initiatives, employee training, and employee recognition. The Offeror's plan for accommodating immediate ramp-up or ramp-down, or reallocation of workforce is based on an optimally sized team to meet continuing requirements, supplemented with temporary resources from core team members, specialty subcontractors, and Subject Matter Experts (SMEs). The Offeror's plan for quickly adapting to changing

missions, requirements, priorities, workloads, and funding fluctuations includes the use of a pool of resources consisting of the combination of on-call SMEs and cross-trained personnel. For fluctuations requiring additional resources, the Offeror will look first for temporary technical capabilities from internal resources, from team member resources, as well as from an on-call SME pool. If resources are not available, then the Offeror will institute a recruitment plan to identify and hire the resources. The Offeror also proposed various methods for dealing with fluctuations requiring a decrease in resources that would effectively mitigate the impact of such decreases.

- MAS7, "Total Compensation Plan" – The Offeror proposed a comprehensive Total Compensation Plan that is expected to attract and retain competent service employees. The elements of the plan should significantly increase employee morale and the probability of effective attraction and retention of highly qualified professional personnel.

Subfactor 3, "Phase-In Plan" – AS&M received a **Very Good** rating for a proposal which demonstrates overall competence with a significant strength, no deficiency, and no significant weakness.

Significant Strength:

- PIP1, "Phase-In-Plan" – The Offeror's Phase-In-Plan provided a comprehensive approach, including a detailed schedule of phase-in activities divided into significant activities. The Offeror's plan is based on utilization of in-place business, management information, IT, and security systems. The Offeror identified a full-time, experienced Phase-In team that brings transition expertise to key activities, which increases the probability of successful contract transition. The Offeror has internal and external methods in place to recruit and hire incumbents and new hires, as well as policies and procedures to retain the caliber of staff needed over the life of the contract. The Offeror's initial staffing plan includes filling the vast majority of technical personnel requirements from the qualified incumbent work force. The event sequencing clearly demonstrated that the Offeror understands the issues inherent to these types of contract transition activities.

Subfactor 4, "Safety, Health and Security" – AS&M received a **Good** rating for a proposal which shows a reasonably sound response and has no significant strength, no deficiency, and no significant weakness.

2. ASRCA

ASRCA received a **Good** rating at the Mission Suitability factor level for a proposal which shows a reasonably sound response and contains a significant strength, several significant weaknesses, and no deficiencies. The findings for ASRCA are summarized below by Mission Suitability Subfactor.

Subfactor 1, "Understanding the Requirements and Technical Approach" – ASRCA received a **Good** rating for a proposal which shows a reasonably sound response and has no significant strength, no deficiency, and a significant weakness.

Significant Weakness:

- URA2, "Technical Approach to Representative Task Orders (RTOs)" – Section 2 of RTO3 required the Offeror to identify all analytical capabilities and procedures required to conduct a systems analysis of an aerocapture technology demonstration mission. Overall, the Offeror's technical approach demonstrated a significant lack of understanding of typical problems associated with this work by not fully addressing the contractual task requirements in sufficient detail. The Offeror failed to provide a comprehensive assessment of key existing analysis capabilities and processes, and also failed to include a plan to identify and acquire any additional needed capabilities. The Offeror proposed a staffing plan that included an insufficient number of labor hours to perform a satisfactory systems analysis study, resulting in a cost estimate much lower than anticipated for the scope of this task.

Subfactor 2, Management and Staffing – ASRCA received a **Good** rating for a proposal which shows a reasonably sound response and has no significant strength, no deficiency, and a significant weakness.

Significant Weakness:

- MAS9, "Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) Mitigation Plan" – The Offeror's OCI Mitigation Plan does not fully comply with RFP Section H.4 "Limitation of Future Contracting" and Section H.5 "Organizational Conflicts of Interest".

  The Offeror provided examples of possible organizational conflicts of interest that may result from the award of the contract. The Offeror's strategy to mitigate or eliminate the impacts of several of the examples did not effectively resolve these potential OCI conditions. Furthermore, the Offeror's analysis failed to recognize an existing OCI involving its senior management personnel. As a result, the Offeror did not propose strategies to mitigate or eliminate the impacts of this OCI.

  The Offeror proposed to protect data from unauthorized use and disclosure for a limited period of time although RFP Section H.4 requires the Offeror to protect data as long as these data remain proprietary or confidential.

  The Offeror's plan limited restrictions on subsequent work assignments to a specific period of time although RFP Section H.4 states restrictions shall remain in effect for a reasonable time, as agreed to by the Contracting Officer (CO) and the Contractor, sufficient to avoid unfair competitive advantage.

  The Offeror's plan also included providing a prompt and full disclosure and a mitigation plan to the CO upon identification of an actual or potential OCI

although RFP Section H.5 requires the submittal of a plan to the CO within two working days.

Subfactor 3, "Phase-In Plan" – ASRCA received a **Good** rating for a proposal which shows a reasonably sound response and has no significant strength, deficiency or significant weakness.

Subfactor 4, "Safety, Health and Security" – ASRCA received a **Good** rating for a proposal which shows a reasonably sound response and has a significant strength, no deficiency, and a significant weakness.

Significant Strength:

- SHS2, "Information Technology (IT) Security" – The Offeror demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of IT Security issues through discussion of numerous current regulations. The Offeror will perform Self-Assessments, Risk Assessments, and Privacy Impact Assessments. The Offeror proposed a phased approach for Information Technology (IT) Security. The Offeror demonstrated knowledge of data classification and security controls. The Offeror proposed to provide recurring IT Security Training for all employees to maintain security awareness, with substantial training for Systems Administrators.

Significant Weakness:

- SHS1, "Safety and Health Plan" – The Offeror's Safety and Health Plan referenced numerous documents that are not relevant to LaRC's safety and health requirements, are obsolete, or do not currently exist. The Offeror's plan also did not identify other safety considerations unique to the performance of the contract. The Offeror did not address non-ionizing radiation in sufficient detail despite the fact that the PWS contains numerous requirements for LIDAR operations. The Offeror also failed to address other unique safety considerations such as flight test operations (RFP Section H.18) and the use of humans and animals as experiment test subjects (RFP Sections H.26 and H.27).

3. QSS

QSS received a **Good** rating at the Mission Suitability factor level for a proposal which shows a reasonably sound response and contains several significant strengths, a significant weakness, and no deficiencies. The findings for QSS are summarized below by Mission Suitability Subfactor.

Subfactor 1, "Understanding the Requirements and Technical Approach" – QSS received a **Good** rating for a proposal which shows a reasonably sound response and has no significant strength, deficiency, and no significant weakness.

Subfactor 2, "Management and Staffing" – QSS received a **Good** rating for a proposal which shows a reasonably sound response and has a few significant strengths, no deficiency, and a significant weakness.

Significant Strengths:

- MAS1, "Management Approach" – The Offeror presented a comprehensive approach to the day-to-day management of the total contract as well as the individual Task Orders. The Offeror developed a Project Management Plan tailored to the contract requirements which will be used as the framework for all contract activities, setting forth the set of processes and procedures used to manage and execute the project. The Offeror provided a discussion of its full life-cycle process used for management of Task Orders. The Offeror's approach for managing the extensive range of services delineated in the PWS was based on a top-level breakdown of the scope of work, with a definition of the general characteristics of the Task Orders used to identify differing performance assessment criteria for each area of the PWS. The Offeror's tailored approach to Task Order management and performance assessments will ensure responsiveness to each unique requirement.

- MAS7, "Total Compensation Plan" – The Offeror proposed a comprehensive Total Compensation Plan that is expected to attract and retain competent service employees. The elements of the plan should significantly increase employee morale and the probability of effective attraction and retention of highly qualified professional personnel.

Significant Weakness:

- MAS9, "Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) Mitigation Plan" – The Offeror's proposal stated that "the QSS team has no OCI issues now or in the future", which demonstrates that the Offeror does not completely understand possible OCIs that might result from the award of the contract, and that such OCIs may arise as the result of Task Order requirements that are typical of the PWS.

Subfactor 3, "Phase-In Plan" – QSS received a **Very Good** rating for a proposal which demonstrates overall competence with a significant strength, no deficiency, and no significant weakness.

Significant Strength:

- PIP1, "Phase-In Plan" – The Offeror's Phase-In-Plan provided a comprehensive approach which included a detailed schedule of phase-in activities. The Offeror's plan included the identification of significant phase in activities. [redacted] The Offeror's initial staffing plan is based on hiring the vast majority of the qualified incumbent workforce, as well as recruiting for critical vacancies. The Offeror's process included transferring personnel clearances

as part of the Phase-In-Plan. The plan's level of detail and event sequencing showed an understanding of the issues and increases the likelihood of a successful transition from the incumbent contract.

Subfactor 4, "Safety, Health and Security" – QSS received a **Good** rating for a proposal which shows a reasonably sound response and has no significant strength, no deficiency, and no significant weakness.

4. Swales

Swales received a **Very Good** rating at the Mission Suitability factor level for a proposal which demonstrated overall competence with numerous significant strengths, no significant weakness, and no deficiency. The findings for Swales are summarized below by Mission Suitability Subfactor.

Subfactor 1, "Understanding the Requirements and Technical Approach" – Swales received an **Excellent** rating for a comprehensive and thorough proposal of exceptional merit with numerous significant strengths, no deficiency, and no significant weakness.

Significant Strengths:

- URA1, "Technical Operations Plan" – The Offeror demonstrated an exceptional understanding of and approach for meeting the PWS requirements. The Offeror's extensive lists with representative examples of understanding and approaches demonstrated its understanding of relevant technologies to accomplish the PWS requirements. The lists included the Offeror's approach for performing related research for each example. The examples also demonstrated an understanding of the multi-discipline array of design, analysis, and simulation tools required to accomplish the extensive range of services delineated in the PWS. The Offeror also identified unique issues and risks associated with performing the requirements of the PWS within NASA LaRC's research environment, potential impacts of the risks, and mitigation approaches.

- URA1, "Technical Operations Plan" – The Offeror presented clear examples of its extensive expertise and experience in each of the typical work areas of Section 2.1 to 2.5 of the PWS. The Offeror's expertise and experience are directly applicable to the PWS requirements. In addition, one of the Offeror's teaming partners has broad R&T expertise and experience in aeronautics, aerodynamics, structure and materials, and access to space.

- URA2, "Technical Approach to Representative Task Orders (RTOs)" – Section 2 of RTO1 required the Offeror to design, fabricate, integrate, and perform acceptance testing of all hardware/software necessary to successfully incorporate the yaw alignment system into standard tunnel operations. The Offeror's approach demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the Task Order requirements by

identifying typical problems associated with this work. The Offeror identified and discussed three detailed concepts to resolve those problems. The Offeror's proposed use [redacted] will minimize technical and schedule risk. In addition, to verify the accuracy of the system, the Offeror proposed [redacted] used [redacted]

- URA2, "Technical Approach to Representative Task Orders (RTOs)" – Section 2 of RTO2 required the Offeror to design and analyze cylinders representative of subscale fuselage components. The Offeror presented a precise and comprehensive approach that demonstrated a thorough understanding of the resolution of typical problems through optimization analyses, visualization systems, and procedures. This included the Offeror proposing [redacted]

- URA2, "Technical Approach to Representative Task Orders (RTOs)" – Section 2 of RTO3 required the Offeror to identify all analytical capabilities and procedures required to conduct a systems analysis of an aerocapture technology demonstration mission. The Offeror's approach demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the Task Order requirements by identifying typical problems associated with this work. The Offeror proposed [redacted] A systematic approach for developing and evaluating a variety of technical concepts and architectures for resolution of the Task Order requirements was also presented. The Offeror proposed [redacted]

- URA2, "Technical Approach to Representative Task Orders (RTOs)" – Section 2 of the RTO4 required the Offeror to investigate the application of advanced technology to unmanned long duration aircraft akin to the conceptual Air Force Sensor Craft. The Offeror presented an exceptional approach for resolution of the typical problems through explanation of the steps and rationale for each part of the trade study, analyses, and experimental work. The Offeror demonstrated a comprehensive understanding of the primary components of a comprehensive optimization process for the selection of advanced technologies. The Offeror also proposed an innovative approach to enable quick turnaround and interaction between normally incompatible analysis codes [redacted] The Offeror also proposed several innovative ideas for aerodynamic flow control.

- URA2, "Technical Approach to Representative Task Orders (RTOs)" – Section 2 of RTO5 required the Offeror to provide expertise, consulting, and technical review as well as the support of various and diverse technical experts for the NESC ELF Recovery Mission. The Offeror presented an exceptional approach for resolution of typical problems by demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of the required analyses and procedures. The proposed [redacted]

Subfactor 2, "Management and Staffing" – Swales received a **Very Good** rating for a proposal which demonstrates overall competence with numerous significant strengths, no deficiency, and no significant weakness.

Significant Strengths:

- MAS1, "Management Approach" – The Offeror presented an exceptionally clear and detailed approach to the day-to-day management of the total contract as well as the individual Task Orders. The Offeror's Contract Manager reviews Task Order performance via a series of regularly scheduled management activities which address issues that impact both total contract and individual Task Order performance. The Offeror's approach for managing the extensive range of services was based on a phased Task Order management process. This integrated process will result in highly effective management of the extensive range of services delivered throughout the life cycle of the Task Orders.

- MAS4, "Teaming Arrangements" – The Offeror proposed a suitable and effective teaming arrangement for accomplishing the PWS and Task Order requirements. The Offeror presented an integrated team whereby the plan for distributing the work amongst the team members assured that all PWS areas were covered by [redacted] The work distribution provided depth and redundancy of skill-sets and expertise to assure the successful accomplishment of the PWS requirements. The Offeror described its rationale for determining which team member has primary and secondary responsibility for the successful accomplishment of each of the work areas of the PWS, and defined the percentage of the work to be performed by each team member. In addition, [redacted]

- MAS6, "Continuing Personnel Management" – The Offeror presented a comprehensive approach which included maintaining a competent staff over the life of the contract by providing competitive total compensation plans, employee retention initiatives, employee training, and employee recognition. The Offeror's plan for accommodating immediate ramp-up, ramp-down, or reallocation of workforce is based on a workforce that includes a mix of core competencies that are matrixed to individual jobs as requirements dictate. The Offeror will supplement its workforce,

when required, from an extensive network of consultants and specialty contractors. The Offeror's plan included performing task requirements projection and resource utilization planning to anticipate fluctuations resulting from changing mission requirements, priorities, workload, and funding. The Offeror also proposed various methods for dealing with fluctuations requiring a decrease in resources that would effectively mitigate the impact of such decreases.

- MAS7, "Total Compensation Plan" – The Offeror proposed a comprehensive Total Compensation Plan that is expected to attract and retain competent service employees. The elements of the plan should significantly increase employee morale and the probability of effective attraction and retention of highly qualified professional personnel.

- MAS9, "Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) Mitigation Plan" – The Offeror's OCI Mitigation Plan presented a comprehensive analysis of possible OCIs and included tools to mitigate or eliminate the impacts of those OCIs. The Offeror's adherence to its proposed mitigation plan in day-to-day operations is thoroughly integrated throughout its proposal. The Offeror's proposal for procuring SMEs included early identification and avoidance of OCI issues. Further, the Offeror's response to RTO5, (which required hiring numerous SMEs) effectively addressed OCI concerns. The Offeror also designated a specific team member as an OCI workforce mitigation. As an additional proactive measure, the Offeror will provide employees with orientation on business ethics, OCI avoidance, and recognition and proper handling of proprietary data upon both hiring and assignment to a task.

The Offeror received a corresponding weakness for its plan for providing a prompt and full disclosure and mitigation plan to the CO upon identification of an actual or potential OCI, although RFP Section H.5 requires the submittal of a plan to the CO within two working days. In addition, the Offeror also proposed to protect data from unauthorized use and disclosure for a limited period of time although RFP Section H.4 requires the Offeror to protect data as long as these data remain proprietary or confidential.

- MAS10, "Quality Management Systems" – The Offeror's proposal included a Quality Plan that demonstrated a clear understanding of the activities required to ensure effective planning, operation and control of processes/work activities to perform the work specific to this contract. The Offeror's plan as well as its Hampton Operation QMS Manual is [redacted] The Offeror is ISO 9001 Certified/Registered and is AS9100 Certified/Registered. The Offeror submitted a compliance plan for achieving and maintaining a CMMI®-SE/SW Capability Level 2 or higher rating as well as a letter from an appropriate company official expressing commitment to becoming rated within nine months of the contract effective date.

Subfactor 3, "Phase-In Plan" – Swales received a **Very Good** rating for a proposal which demonstrates overall competence with a significant strength, no deficiency, and no significant weakness.

Significant Strength:

- PIP1, "Phase-In Plan" – The Offeror's Phase-In-Plan (PIP) included a detailed schedule of phase-in activities. The schedule for completion included staffing and recruiting, transition of Task Orders, an electronic Task Order system, an IT development plan, and certified procurement systems. The Offeror's PIP is based on utilization of in-place business, management information, IT, and security systems. The Offeror also provided a Phase-In Organization Structure that is well-suited for the successful accomplishment of Phase-In activities. The Offeror identified a full-time dedicated team with key positions from the Offeror's team members. Focused areas of responsibilities are assigned to each position, which increases the probability of a successful contract transition. The Offeror's initial staffing plan was based on hiring its incumbent workforce, and also included new hires from non-Offeror companies' incumbent workforce. The Offeror's process included transferring personnel clearances as part of the PIP. The event sequencing clearly demonstrated the Offeror's understanding of the issues inherent to contract transition activities.

Subfactor 4, "Safety, Health and Security" – Swales received a **Very Good** rating for a proposal which demonstrates overall competence with a significant strength, no deficiency, and no significant weakness.

Significant Strength:

- SHS1, "Safety and Health Plan" – The Offeror's Safety and Health Plan thoroughly complies with applicable federal and state statutory and regulatory requirements, as well as applicable NASA-wide and LaRC specific policies and procedures. The Offeror's plan also demonstrates a comprehensive understanding of potential safety considerations unique to the performance of the contract. Specifically, [redacted]

B. FACTOR 2: COST/PRICE ANALYSIS

A cost/price analyst who was an SEB consultant evaluated the cost proposals for cost realism and price reasonableness to establish probable cost and to ensure compliance with the requirements of the RFP. There is approximately an 8.44% difference between the highest and lowest proposed cost. The offers from lowest to highest for the proposed cost are as follows:

Offeror	Proposed Cost
QSS	[redacted]
ASRCA	
AS&M	
Swales	

The SEB evaluated each cost proposal to determine the extent to which it reflected performance addressed in the technical proposal and the Offeror's capability to accomplish the contract objectives within the cost proposed in accordance with Section M-4," FACTOR 2 – Cost/Price Analysis" of the RFP. The SEB provided the results of its review to the NASA Cost/Price Analyst who incorporated the results, along with information from Defense Contract Audit Agency (DCAA) offices, into the detailed analysis of the individual cost proposals. Pursuant to NFS 1815.305(a)(1)(B)(c), as part of performing the cost realism analyses, the Cost/Price Analyst established a level of confidence for the probable cost assessment for each proposal. Probable cost confidence is the degree to which the probable costs can be relied upon to ascertain the likely cost of performance for each Offeror. In developing probable costs, the Cost/Price Analyst relied upon the individual proposals, the analysis of these proposals, and the SEB and DCAA input. After fully evaluating the proposals, the Cost/Price Analyst considered the cost proposals to be reasonable and realistic as adjusted below.

I carefully analyzed the cost evaluations, and questioned the SEB on the adjustments made to derive probable costs for the four Offerors. The difference in probable cost is approximately 6.41% from lowest to highest. The offers based on probable cost from lowest to highest, plus the Government estimate, are as follows:

Offeror	Evaluated Price (Probable Cost)	Probable Cost Confidence
QSS	[redacted]	Moderate
ASRCA		Low
Swales		High
AS&M		High
Government Estimate	$180.8M	

Where used below, the definition of the term "significant subcontractor" or "teaming partner" refers to "any subcontract over $550,000 of direct labor effort", as set forth in Section L-18, Volume I – Technical Proposal: Factor 1 – Mission Suitability", of the RFP. The following summaries of the Cost/Price analysis for each of the four Offerors (presented in alphabetical order) include the probable cost adjustments made for each Offeror and SEB's significant concerns regarding each cost proposal:

1. AS&M

Significant Adjustments:

- AS&M's proposed overhead was adjusted for IT costs that did not adequately account for hardware and System Administrator costs necessary to comply with NPR 2810.1A, resulting in a [redacted] adjustment.
- AS&M proposed materials and travel costs based on estimated subcontractor unburdened labor costs, resulting in a [redacted] adjustment.

Concerns for which no adjustments were made:

- Proposed unburdened labor rates for AS&M and all subcontractors are higher than the current Systems Analysis and Mission Support (SAMS) contract unburdened labor rates.
- The proposed Schedule of Rates is incorrect as a result of the adjustment made to AS&M's overhead (OH) rate.
- The difference between the proposed Schedule of Rates and the Schedule of Rates after cost realism adjustment is such that there is minimal risk of cost overruns (a total adjustment of [redacted] to the Government to award with the proposed Schedule of Rates used to estimate Task Orders. Using the proposed Schedule of Rates would result in minimal differences between the estimated and actual cost of Task Order performance.

- The significant subcontractors' proposed escalation was based on guidance from AS&M and may not reflect actual wage increases.

The Probable Cost Confidence Level for AS&M is **High**.

2. ASRCA

Significant Adjustments:
- Proposed unburdened labor rates for ASRCA and all subcontractors are low compared to the current SAMS contract unburdened labor rates, resulting in a [redacted] adjustment to ASRCA's labor costs, and [redacted] to its subcontractor costs.
- The proposed IT costs in Program Management Office cost for ASRCA and all subcontractors did not adequately account for hardware, software, and Systems Administrator costs necessary to comply with NPR 2810.1A, resulting in a [redacted] adjustment.

Concerns for which no adjustments were made:
- The Schedule of Rates is incorrect as a result of the labor adjustments to ASRCA and each subcontractor's costs.
- The difference between the proposed Schedule of Rates and the Schedule of Rates after cost realism adjustment is such that there is significant risk of cost overruns (a total adjustment to labor of [redacted] to the Government to award with the proposed Schedule of Rates used to estimate Task Orders. Using the proposed Schedule of Rates could result in significant differences between the estimated and actual cost of Task Order performance.
- A significant subcontractor did not provide Rate Charts, Schedule of Rates, supporting information, or explanation of the derivation of the proposed indirect and labor rates. Further, the significant subcontractor proposed the same unburdened labor rates as ASRCA, which may not reflect its actual rates.
- Two significant subcontractors failed to demonstrate that the minimum health and welfare benefit for Service Contract Act Wage Determination (WD) positions (non-professional) was met.
- A significant subcontractor failed to submit an electronic copy of the proposal as required by the RFP, and proposed costs had to be verified to the supporting information manually. Further, program support costs could not be verified to the supporting information. This proposal did not entirely correlate to the proposal submitted to ASRCA. DCAA has determined that the significant subcontractor's accounting system is inadequate in part, although acceptable for negotiations.
- A significant subcontractor's electronic proposal cost forms were not linked, the data in the primary charts did not automatically roll up into the summary charts. Further, labor costs on Cost Forms B1-B5 were determined using burdened rates, rather than unburdened rates as required by the RFP.
- Confidence level for ASRCA, [redacted] is low, [redacted] is moderate.

The Probable Cost Confidence Level for ASRCA is **Low**.

3. QSS

Significant Adjustments: Adjustments totaling [redacted] were made:

- QSS and its subcontractors [redacted]
  - Proposed unburdened labor rates which are low compared to the current SAMS contract unburdened labor rates.
  - Proposed escalation which is low compared to NASA guidance.
  - Did not escalate the WD positions for contract years 2 – 5.
- Subcontractors [redacted]
  - Proposed labor rates based upon QSS' corporate bid rates, which do not reflect the actual subcontractor labor rates provided by DCAA.

Concerns for which no adjustments were made :

- QSS and its subcontractors [redacted]
  - Proposed the same productive hours, direct labor rates, and escalation.
- QSS' proposed indirect rates did not consider the impact of the TEAMS contract.
- The proposed Schedule of Rates is incorrect as a result of the labor adjustments to the QSS and each subcontractor's costs.
  - The difference between the proposed Schedule of Rates and the Schedule of Rates after cost realism adjustment is such that there is moderate risk of cost overruns (a total adjustment of [redacted] to the Government to award with the proposed Schedule of Rates used to estimate Task Orders. Using the proposed Schedule of Rates could result in moderate differences between the estimated and actual cost of Task Order performance.

The Probable Cost Confidence Level for QSS is **Moderate**.

4. Swales

Significant Adjustments:

- Swales and a significant subcontractor proposed a labor rate for Administrative Associate which did not meet the WD minimum requirement, and were adjusted [redacted]
- Swales did not propose escalation for computer costs in contract years 2 – 5, resulting in an adjustment of [redacted]
- A significant subcontractor proposed escalation which did not match its compensation plan. The proposed OH and G&A were adjusted for the Division Administrative Contracting Officer (DACO) approved Forward Pricing Rates (FPR). Additionally, the proposed OH included a contingency if awarded both the Science, Technology, and Research Support Services (STARSS) and TEAMS contracts, resulting in overall adjustment of [redacted]

Concerns for which no adjustments were made :

- Proposed unburdened labor rates for Swales are high compared to the current SAMS contract unburdened labor rates.
- A significant subcontractor's Labor Rates in Cost Forms B1–B5 and Schedule of Rates were absolute values. No Rate Charts were provided. The burdened rates in

the Schedule of Rates could not be verified to the unburdened labor and indirect rates used to develop the cost proposal.

- A significant subcontractor did not demonstrate that minimum health and welfare benefits were met for positions defined as WD.
- The proposed Schedule of Rates is incorrect as a result of the labor and indirect rate adjustments to the Prime and subcontractor costs.
  - The difference between the proposed Schedule of Rates and the Schedule of Rates after cost realism adjustment is such that there is a minute risk of cost overruns (a total adjustment of less than [redacted] to the Government to award with the proposed Schedule of Rates used to estimate Task Orders. Using the proposed Schedule of Rates could result in minute differences between the estimated and actual cost of Task Order performance.

The Probable cost confidence level for Swales is **High**.

C. FACTOR 3: PAST PERFORMANCE

Set forth below in alphabetical order is a summary of the Past Performance findings for the four Offerors. While the findings below generally refer only to the Offeror's Prime Contractor by name, the past performance of the Prime plus the past performance of all significant subcontractors or teaming partners over $550k were considered in developing these findings.

Offeror	Adjectival Rating
AS&M	Good
ASRCA	Good
QSS	Good
Swales	Excellent

1. AS&M: Good Overall Rating

AS&M received a **Good** overall rating for Past Performance, with an **Excellent** rating on the Performance Component of this Factor and a **Relevant** rating on the Relevance Component of this Factor.

Performance Component: AS&M had an overall Performance rating of **Excellent.** AS&M's performance in its previous work has been exemplary, with contract requirements achieved in a timely, efficient and economical manner. The preponderance of customer past performance ratings for AS&M was in the Excellent range. A few very minor deficiencies were identified with no adverse impact on overall performance.

Relevance Component: AS&M had an overall Relevance rating of **Relevant** based upon its demonstrated Relevant experience in PWS Sections 3.1, "Technical Management & Administrative"; 3.2, "Systems Analysis & Technology Integration"; 3.3, "Engineering & Operations"; and 3.4, "Research and Technology" with Very Relevant experience in PWS Section 3.5, "General Mission Support". While AS&M has demonstrated experience managing contracts of similar content, it has not demonstrated experience managing a contract of the size and complexity of TEAMS.

In accordance with Section M–5, "Factor 3 – Past Performance", the combination of **Excellent** performance and **Relevant** experience resulted in an overall rating of **Good** for AS&M.

2. ASRCA: Good Overall Rating

ASRCA received a **Good** overall rating for Past Performance, with an **Excellent** rating on the Performance Component of this Factor and a **Relevant** rating on the Relevance Component of this Factor.

Performance Component: ASRCA had an overall Performance rating of **Excellent.** ASRCA's performance in its previous work has been exemplary, with contract requirements achieved in a timely, efficient and economical manner. The preponderance of customer past performance ratings for ASRCA was in the **Excellent** range. A very few minor deficiencies were identified with no adverse impact on overall performance.

Relevance Component: ASRCA had an overall Relevance rating of **Relevant** based upon its demonstrated **Very Relevant** experience in PWS Sections 3.1, "Technical Management & Administrative"; **Relevant** experience in PWS Sections 3.3, "Engineering & Operations" and 3.5, "General Mission Support"; and **Somewhat Relevant** experience in PWS Sections 3.2, "Systems Analysis & Technology Integration" and 3.4, "Research and Technology". While ASRCA has demonstrated experience managing contracts of similar size, it has not demonstrated experience managing a contract of the content and complexity of TEAMS.

In accordance with Section M-5, "Factor 3 – Past Performance", the combination of **Excellent** performance and **Relevant** experience resulted in an overall rating of **Good** for ASRCA.

3. QSS: Good Overall Rating

QSS received a **Good** overall rating for Past Performance, with an **Excellent** rating on the Performance Component of this Factor and a **Relevant** rating on the Relevance Component of this Factor.

Performance Component: QSS had an overall Performance rating of **Excellent.** QSS' performance in its previous work has been exemplary, with contract requirements achieved in a timely, efficient and economical manner. The preponderance of customer past performance ratings for QSS was in the Excellent range. A very few minor deficiencies were identified with no adverse impact on overall performance.

Relevance Component: QSS had an overall Relevance rating of **Relevant** based upon its demonstrated **Very Relevant** experience in PWS Sections 3.1, "Technical Management & Administrative"; **Relevant** experience in PWS Sections 3.3, "Engineering & Operations" and 3.5, "General Mission Support"; and **Somewhat Relevant** experience in PWS Sections 3.2, "Systems Analysis & Technology Integration" and 3.4, "Research and Technology". QSS has demonstrated experience in performing contracts similar to TEAMS in size, content, and complexity.

In accordance with Section M-5, "Factor 3 – Past Performance", the combination of **Excellent** performance and **Relevant** experience resulted in an overall rating of **Good** for QSS.

4. Swales: <u>Excellent</u> Overall Rating

Swales received an **Excellent** overall rating for Past Performance, with an **Excellent** rating on the Performance Component of this Factor and a **Highly Relevant** rating on the Relevance Component of this Factor.

Performance Component: Swales had an overall Performance rating of **Excellent.** Swales performance in its previous work has been exemplary, with contract requirements achieved in a timely, efficient, and economical manner. The preponderance of customer past performance ratings for Swales was in the Excellent range. A very few minor deficiencies were identified with no adverse impact on overall performance.

Relevance Component: Swales had an overall Relevance rating of **Highly Relevant** in every area of the PWS, except Section 3.2, "Systems Analysis & Technology Integration", where it received a rating of **Very Relevant**. Swales has demonstrated experience in performing contracts similar to TEAMS in size, content, and complexity.

In accordance with Section M-5, "Factor 3 – Past Performance", the combination of **Excellent** performance and **Highly Relevant** experience resulted in an overall rating of **Excellent** for Swales.

VII. Basis for Selection

A. Comparative Assessment:

The following includes my comparative assessment of the relative non-cost/price strengths and weaknesses of the proposal I have selected for award versus the other three proposals, the Source Selection Decision and the basis for that decision. It is my opinion that the SEB conducted a comprehensive, fair, and unbiased evaluation of the proposals and that their evaluation is fully in accordance with the evaluation factors set forth in the RFP.

Prior to the SEB presentation to me on October 23, 2006, I received a copy of the presentation which included all of the SEB's findings. I also considered the requirement for the SSA to comparatively assess the proposals against all source selection criteria as presented in the TEAMS RFP. I carefully considered the information that I received prior to the SEB's presentation and I carefully questioned the SEB regarding aspects of various findings during the presentation. After the SEB's presentation, the assembled members and I considered the relative importance of the evaluation criteria. As presented in Section M-6 of the TEAMS RFP, "Relative Importance Of Evaluation Factors", Mission Suitability, Cost, and Past Performance are of essentially equal importance; and Mission Suitability and Past Performance, when combined, are significantly more important than Cost. Swales had the strongest proposal in terms of Mission Suitability and Past Performance.

On November 13, 2006, I met again with the SEB Chair, Contracting Officer, Procurement Officer and Legal Counsel to review the SEB's findings as a result of Amendment 3 to the RFP. The ratings discussed in this Source Selection Statement reflect the SEB's evaluation of the amended proposals.

The following sections present my comparative assessment of the successful Offeror, versus each of the other Offerors in alphabetical order. No overall ranking of the other proposals was established.

1. Swales compared to AS&M:

Factor 1, "Mission Suitability": The Swales proposal for Factor 1, "Mission Suitability" is rated as **Very Good** while the AS&M proposal is rated as **Good**.

Subfactor 1, "Understanding the Requirements and Technical Approach": The Swales proposal for Subfactor 1 is rated as **Excellent** while the AS&M proposal is rated as **Good**. The Swales proposal offers substantially greater value to the Government than the AS&M proposal offers under Mission Suitability Subfactor 1.

Areas of Superior Value in AS&M's Proposal:
None.

Areas of Superior Value in Swales' Proposal:
Swales clearly demonstrated a superior technical approach and expertise to accomplish the wide breadth and variety of the PWS requirements. Swales presented representative examples of understanding and approaches to accomplish each PWS requirement. These examples included its approach for performing related research, understanding of relevant technologies, as well as an understanding of the multi-discipline array of design, analysis, and simulation tools. Swales also identified unique issues and risks associated with performing the requirements of the PWS within NASA LaRC's research environment, potential impacts of these risks, and mitigation approaches. These examples also demonstrated Swales' extensive expertise and experience in each of the typical work areas of the PWS. Swales' approach and expertise were considered to be significant strengths. In comparison, AS&M received strengths for its clear understanding of and its technical approach to, as well as its expertise and experience to accomplish the PWS requirements; however AS&M's proposal did not provide the level of depth and detail that Swales' proposal provided. While AS&M does possess strengths in this Subfactor, Swales' comprehensive understanding of and extensive expertise in all of the areas of the PWS represents a superior value to the Government.

Swales received a significant strength for each of the five Representative Task Orders (RTOs). Swales' demonstration of its understanding of the Task Order requirements, approach to unique and innovative problem resolutions, understanding of alternative solutions, and as well as having received a strength for consistently appropriate staffing and costing estimates, was clearly superior to AS&M's proposal. In comparison, AS&M received strengths for its technical approach for RTO2, RTO3, RTO4, and RTO5 with a corresponding weakness in the staffing plan and cost estimate for RTO4. AS&M also received a weakness for RTO1 for its incomplete technical approach and a cost estimate which was inconsistent with its technical approach. There was a clear difference in the quality and thoroughness of the responses to the RTOs between the two proposals. While AS&M does possess strengths in this area, Swales' comprehensive understanding of and approach to the RTOs represents a superior value to the Government.

Areas with Similar Value:
None.

Swales therefore represents a substantially greater value to the Government in Subfactor 1 since its proposal provides a significantly superior overall understanding and approach to meeting the RFP requirements.

Subfactor 2, "Management and Staffing": Both the Swales and the AS&M proposals for Subfactor 2 are rated as **Very Good**. The Swales proposal offers slightly greater value to the Government than the AS&M proposal offers under Mission Suitability Subfactor 2.

Areas of Superior Value in AS&M's Proposal:
None.

Areas of Superior Value in Swales' Proposal:
In MAS9, "Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) Mitigation Plan", Swales received a significant strength for its comprehensive analysis and understanding of OCIs throughout its proposal. Swales received a corresponding weakness for not clearly addressing the required time periods specified in the RFP for protecting proprietary data and notifying the Contracting Officer of a potential OCI. In comparison, AS&M received a weakness for not clearly addressing the required time periods specified in the RFP for limitations on future contracting, protecting proprietary data and notifying the Contracting Officer of a potential OCI. AS&M did not have any corresponding strengths to offset this weakness. Based upon the broad depth and breadth of the PWS, there is a significant potential for OCIs in the performance of the TEAMS contract. Swales' addressed OCIs throughout its proposal, which indicates a high awareness of the risk of OCIs in the performance of the TEAMS contract. I therefore believe that Swales' comprehensive analysis of possible OCIs and mitigation of those OCIs represents a superior value to the Government.

Swales also received a significant strength for MAS10, "Quality Management Systems", particularly due to its inclusion of a quality plan [redacted] AS&M received a strength for MAS10 due to its compliance with the quality management system requirements, along with a corresponding weakness due to limiting its quality plan to hardware quality assurance. While AS&M possesses a strength in this area, Swales' submitted a complete quality plan customized to LaRC operations which can be immediately implemented upon award and therefore represents a superior value to the Government.

Areas with Similar Value:
AS&M and Swales both received significant strengths in MAS1, "Management Approach"; MAS4, "Teaming Arrangements"; MAS6, "Continuing Personnel Management"; and MAS7, "Total Compensation Plan". Both also received strengths in MAS2, "Organizational Structure"; MAS3, "Identification of Key Positions",;MAS5, "Subject Matter Experts"; and MAS8, "Electronic Task Order Management Control System(s)". All of these elements of Subfactor 2 were considered to be essentially equal in value.

Swales and AS&M had a significant number of areas in Subfactor 2 which were considered to be essentially equal in value. However, Swales' superior proposal in the areas of OCI and Quality Management Systems makes its proposal a slightly greater value to the Government.

Subfactor 3, "Phase-In Plan": Both the Swales and the AS&M proposals for Subfactor 3 are rated as **Very Good**. Both Offerors have significant strengths for their proposed Phase-In Plans, and the two plans are considered to be essentially equal in value. I

therefore did not consider the Phase-In Plan to be a discriminating factor between Swales and AS&M.

Subfactor 4, "Safety, Health and Security": Both the Swales and the AS&M proposals for Subfactor 4 are rated as **Good**. The Swales proposal offers slightly greater value to the Government than the AS&M proposal offers under Mission Suitability Subfactor 4.

Areas of Superior Value in AS&M's Proposal:
AS&M received a strength in SHS2, "Information Technology (IT) Security" for its clear understanding of IT Security issues as well as NASA and LaRC IT policies and procedures. In comparison, Swales received a weakness for its approach to IT Security which did not fully comply with all NASA and LaRC policies and procedures.

Areas of Superior Value in Swales' Proposal:
Swales received a significant strength in SHS1, "Safety and Health Plan" for its comprehensive understanding of potential safety considerations unique to the performance of the contract. Specifically, Swales' plan included [redacted] In comparison, AS&M received a weakness for not demonstrating a comprehensive understanding of potential safety considerations and only identifying one of the safety considerations unique to the performance of the contract.

Areas with Similar Value:
AS&M and Swales both received strengths in SHS3, "Use of Foreign Sources" and SHS4, "Export Control".

Swales and AS&M had several areas in Subfactor 4 which were considered to be essentially equal in value. Swales demonstrated significant strength in its Safety and Health Plan specific to the TEAMS effort, which is considered to be of greater value to the Government than AS&M's demonstrated strength in IT Security. Overall, Swales' proposal represented a slightly greater value to the Government in Subfactor 4.

Factor 2 (Cost/Price Analysis):
Under Factor 2 (Cost/Price Analysis), AS&M's evaluated price or probable cost of [redacted] for the total 5-year term of the contract is [redacted] or [redacted] higher than Swales' evaluated price of [redacted] The probable cost confidence is **High** for both AS&M and Swales. This provides me with a reasonable assurance that both AS&M and Swales' probable cost can be relied upon to predict the likely cost of performance. AS&M has a total upward probable cost adjustment of [redacted] primarily for the following two areas: unrealistically low computer costs in the amount of [redacted] and adjustments to "other direct costs" from individual subcontractor analysis, [redacted] Swales has a total downward probable cost adjustment of [redacted] primarily for the following three areas:

labor costs [redacted], computer costs [redacted] and subcontractor costs to reflect [redacted] adjustments made from analysis of each subcontractor, plus Swales' burdens [redacted]

Factor 3 (Past Performance):
Under Factor 3 (Past Performance), AS&M has an overall rating of **Good**, compared to Swales' overall rating of **Excellent**. Both AS&M and Swales demonstrated exemplary performance on previous work (as reported by their customers). AS&M had an overall relevance rating of **Relevant** based upon its demonstrated **Relevant** experience in PWS Sections 3.1, "Technical Management & Administrative"; 3.2, "Systems Analysis & Technology Integration"; 3.3, "Engineering & Operations"; and 3.4, "Research and Technology" with Very Relevant experience in PWS Section 3.5, "General Mission Support". The combination of **Excellent** performance and **Relevant** experience resulted in an overall rating of **Good** for AS&M. In comparison, Swales had an overall relevance rating of **Highly Relevant** based upon its demonstrated **Highly Relevant** experience in PWS Sections 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5, with a **Very Relevant** experience rating in PWS Section 3.2. The combination of **Excellent** performance and **Highly Relevant** experience resulted in an overall rating of **Excellent** for Swales. While AS&M has demonstrated experience managing contracts of similar content, it has not demonstrated experience managing a contract of the size and complexity of TEAMS. Swales has demonstrated such experience by performing the SAMS contract, which is similar to TEAMS in size, content, and complexity.

Comparative Assessment Summary:

Compared to AS&M, Swales has an overall **Very Good** technical proposal, superior past performance, and an evaluated price that is [redacted] lower than AS&M. It is my conclusion that the Swales proposal represents a substantially greater value than the AS&M proposal. Specifically, Swales' significant strengths for its clearly demonstrated superior technical approach and expertise to accomplish the wide breadth and variety of the PWS requirements, its comprehensive analysis and understanding of OCIs, its [redacted] quality plan, and its comprehensive understanding of potential safety considerations unique to the performance of the contract, combined with its excellent rating for past performance, and its lower evaluated price, provides a substantially greater value when compared to AS&M.

2. Swales compared to ASRCA:

Factor 1, "Mission Suitability": The Swales proposal for Factor 1, "Mission Suitability" is rated as **Very Good** while the ASRCA proposal is rated as **Good**.

Subfactor 1, "Understanding the Requirements and Technical Approach": The Swales proposal for Subfactor 1 is rated as **Excellent** while the ASRCA proposal is rated as **Good**. The Swales proposal offers substantially greater value to the Government than the ASRCA proposal offers under Mission Suitability Subfactor 1.

Areas of Superior Value in ASRCA's Proposal:
None.

Areas of Superior Value in Swales' Proposal:
Swales clearly demonstrated a superior technical approach and expertise to accomplish the wide breadth and variety of the PWS requirements. Swales presented representative examples for each PWS requirement. These examples included its approach for performing related research, understanding of relevant technologies, as well as an understanding of the multi-discipline array of design, analysis, and simulation tools. Swales also identified unique issues and risks associated with performing the requirements of the PWS within NASA LaRC's research environment, potential impacts of these risks, and mitigation approaches. These examples also demonstrated Swales' extensive expertise and experience in each of the typical work areas of the PWS. Swales' approach and expertise were considered to be significant strengths. In comparison, ASRCA received strengths for its clear understanding of and its technical approach to, as well as its expertise and experience to accomplish the PWS requirements; however ASRCA's proposal did not provide the level of depth and detail that Swales' proposal provided. While ASRCA does possess strengths in this Subfactor, Swales' comprehensive understanding of and extensive expertise in all of the areas of the PWS represents a superior value to the Government.

Swales received a significant strength for each of the five Representative Task Orders (RTOs). Swales' demonstration of its understanding of the RTO requirements, approach to unique and innovative problem resolutions, understanding of alternative solutions, and as well as having received a strength for consistently appropriate staffing and costing estimates was clearly superior to ASRCA's proposal. In comparison, ASRCA received a significant weakness for RTO3 for an approach that failed to fully address the task requirements. For RTO3, ASRCA's approach did not address key aspects of the task, such as vehicle design, payload selection and integration, mission operations, or post-flight data analysis. Additionally ASRCA's staffing plan did not include sufficient labor hours to perform a systems analysis study. ASRCA also received a weakness for RTO2 for using an inappropriate analysis tool, failing to address all of the task requirements, and proposing an excessive staffing plan. ASRCA received strengths for its technical approach for RTO1 and RTO4. There was a clear difference in the quality and thoroughness of the responses to the RTOs between the two proposals. While ASRCA does possess strengths in this area, Swales' comprehensive understanding of and approach to the RTOs represents a superior value to the Government.

Areas with Similar Value:
None.

Swales therefore represents a substantially greater value to the Government in Subfactor 1 since its proposal provides a significantly superior overall understanding and approach to meeting the RFP requirements.

Subfactor 2, "Management and Staffing": The Swales proposal for Subfactor 2 is rated as **Very Good** while the ASRCA proposal is rated as **Good**. The Swales proposal offers greater value to the Government than the ASRCA proposal offers under Mission Suitability Subfactor 2.

Areas of Superior Value in ASRCA's Proposal:
None.

Areas of Superior Value in Swales' Proposal:
In MAS1, "Management Approach", Swales received a significant strength for its exceptionally clear and detailed approach to the day-to-day management of the contract, including scheduled reviews of issues that impact both the contract and Task Orders. In comparison, ASRCA received a strength for its sound approach to the day-to-day management of the contract including [redacted] However, ASRCA's proposal did not provide the level of detail provided in the Swales proposal. While ASRCA does possess strengths in this area, Swales' exceptionally clear and detailed approach to the day to day management of the contract represents a superior value to the Government.

In MAS4, "Teaming Arrangements", Swales received a significant strength for its integrated team, which provided depth and redundancy of skill sets and expertise as well as its plan to [redacted] mitigate OCI issues. In comparison, ASRCA received a strength for having a suitable teaming arrangement but did not provide the level of detail provided in the Swales proposal. While ASRCA does possess strengths in this area, Swales' integrated team, depth and redundancy of skill sets and expertise, and plan for mitigating OCI issues represents a superior value to the Government.

For MAS6, "Continuing Personnel Management", Swales received a significant strength for its comprehensive approach to retaining competent staff as well as responding to fluctuations in workload. Swales' proposal included employee retention initiatives, training, and recognition and planned performing task requirements projection and resource utilization planning to anticipate fluctuations resulting from changing mission requirements, priorities, workload, and funding. In comparison, ASRCA received a strength for its plan which included employee benefits and recognition but did not discuss in detail its plans for responding to fluctuations in workload to the level of detail found in Swales' proposal. While ASRCA does possess strengths in this area, Swales' comprehensive approach to retaining competent staff as well as responding to fluctuations in workload represents a superior value to the Government.

In MAS7, "Total Compensation Plan", Swales received a significant strength for a comprehensive plan that was expected to significantly increase employee morale and the probability of effective attraction and retention of highly qualified professional personnel. In comparison, ASRCA received a strength for its plan which did not offer the depth and variety of benefits offered by Swales. While ASRCA possesses

strengths in this area, Swales comprehensive total compensation plan is considered to represent a superior value to the Government.

In MAS9, "Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) Mitigation Plan", Swales received a significant strength for its comprehensive analysis and understanding of OCIs throughout its proposal. Swales received a corresponding weakness for not clearly addressing the required time periods specified in the RFP for protecting proprietary data and notifying the Contracting Officer of a potential OCI. In comparison, ASRCA received a significant weakness for its failure to analyze, mitigate, or eliminate the impact of potential OCIs as well as for not clearly addressing the required time periods specified in the RFP for limitations on future contracting, protecting proprietary data and notifying the Contracting Officer of a potential OCI. ASRCA did not have any corresponding strengths to offset this weakness. Based upon the broad depth and breadth of the PWS, there is a significant potential for OCIs in the performance of the TEAMS contract. I am concerned that ASRCA's failure to analyze, mitigate or eliminate the impact of potential OCIs will impact its ability to successfully perform the TEAMS effort. Swales addressed OCIs throughout its proposal, which indicates a high awareness of the risk of OCIs in the performance of the TEAMS contract. I believe that Swales' comprehensive analysis of possible OCIs and mitigation of those OCIs represents a superior value to the Government than ASRCA's proposal.

Swales also received a significant strength for MAS10, "Quality Management Systems", particularly due to its inclusion of a quality plan customized to LaRC operations. ASRCA received a strength for MAS10 due to its compliance with the quality management system requirements and its proposal to develop a [redacted] which can be immediately implemented upon award and therefore represents a superior value to the Government.

Areas with Similar Value:
ASRCA and Swales both received strengths in MAS2, "Organizational Structure"; MAS3, "Identification of Key Positions"; MAS5, "Subject Matter Experts"; and MAS8, "Electronic Task Order Management Control System(s)". All of these elements of Subfactor 2, "Management and Staffing" were considered to be essentially equal in value.

Swales and ASRCA had several areas in Subfactor 2 which were considered to be essentially equal in value. However, Swales' superior proposal in the areas of Management Approach, Teaming Arrangements, Continuing Personnel Management, OCI and Quality Management Systems makes its proposal a greater value to the Government.

Subfactor 3, Phase-In Plan: *The Swales proposal for Subfactor 3 is rated as* **Very Good** while the ASRCA proposal is rated as **Good**. The Swales proposal offers greater

value to the Government than the ASRCA proposal offers under Mission Suitability Subfactor 3. Swales received a significant strength for its proposed Phase-In Plan which included a detailed schedule of phase-in activities. Its PIP was based upon using in-place business, management information, IT and security systems, as well as a full-time dedicated team. In comparison, ASRCA received a strength for its well defined phase-in plan with daily pre-award, phase-in and contract phase in activities with a corresponding weakness as a result of using dates that are not consistent with those in the RFP to develop the PIP. Swales therefore represents a greater value to the Government since its response to Subfactor 3 demonstrates a superior overall understanding of the TEAMS requirements.

Subfactor 4, Safety, Health and Security: Both the Swales and the ASRCA proposals for Subfactor 4 are rated as **Good**. The Swales proposal offers slightly greater value to the Government than the ASRCA proposal offers under Mission Suitability Subfactor 4.

Areas of Superior Value in ASRCA's Proposal:
ASRCA received a significant strength in SHS2, "Information Technology (IT) Security" for its comprehensive understanding of IT Security issues as well as NASA and LaRC IT policies and procedures. ASRCA's proposal included a phased approach, recurring training for all employees, and substantial training for systems administrators. In comparison, Swales received a weakness for its approach to IT Security which did not fully comply with all NASA and LaRC policies and procedures.

Areas of Superior Value in Swales' Proposal:
Swales received a significant strength in SHS1, "Safety and Health Plan" for its comprehensive understanding of potential safety considerations unique to the performance of the contract. Specifically, Swales' plan included [redacted] In comparison, ASRCA received a significant weakness for a plan which referenced numerous documents that are not relevant to LaRC's safety and health requirements, are obsolete, or do not currently exist.

Areas with Similar Value:
ASRCA and Swales both received strengths in SHS3, "Use of Foreign Sources". For SHS4, "Export Control", both received strengths, but ASRCA received a corresponding weakness for referencing the incorrect NASA Policy Directive.

ASRCA demonstrated a significant strength in IT Security versus Swales' demonstrated weakness in this area. Swales demonstrated significant strength in its Safety and Health Plan specific to the TEAMS effort versus ASRCA's significant weakness in which it referenced numerous documents that are not relevant to LaRC's safety and health requirements. ASRCA demonstrated both a strength and a weakness for Export Control, while Swales demonstrated a strength. Because of ASRCA's significant weakness in its Safety and Health Plan and a weakness for Export Control, I believe

that Swales' proposal in Subfactor 4 is of slightly greater value to the Government than ASRCA's proposal.

Factor 2 (Cost/Price Analysis):
Under Factor 2 (Cost/Price Analysis), ASRCA's evaluated cost of [redacted] for the total [redacted] A cost realism adjustment of -50 points was made to ASRCA's Mission Suitability score since adjustments to its proposed cost exceeded the 5% threshold between proposed and probable cost as specified in Section M-7, "Cost Realism Adjustment" of the RFP. The probable cost confidence is high for Swales and low for ASRCA. This provides me with a high assurance that Swales' probable cost can be relied upon to predict its likely cost of performance, and a low confidence that ASRCA's probable cost can be relied upon to predict its likely cost of performance. ASRCA had a net upward probable cost adjustment of [redacted] primarily for unrealistically low proposed unburdened labor rates for ASRCA and all subcontractors ([redacted]), and inadequate proposed IT costs in Program Management Office costs ([redacted]). Swales has a total downward probable cost adjustment of [redacted] primarily for the following three areas: labor costs, [redacted], computer costs, [redacted], and subcontractor costs to reflect adjustments made from analysis of each subcontractor, plus Swales' burdens, [redacted]

Factor 3 (Past Performance):
Under Factor 3 (Past Performance), ASRCA has an overall rating of **Good**, compared to Swales' overall rating of **Excellent**. Both ASRCA and Swales demonstrated exemplary performance on previous work (as reported by their customers) and received ratings of **Excellent**. ASRCA had an overall Relevance rating of **Relevant** based upon its demonstrated **Very Relevant** experience in PWS Sections 3.1, "Technical Management & Administrative"; **Relevant** experience in PWS Sections 3.3, "Engineering & Operations" and 3.5, "General Mission Support"; and **Somewhat Relevant** experience in PWS Sections 3.2, "Systems Analysis & Technology Integration" and 3.4, "Research and Technology". The combination of **Excellent** performance and **Relevant** experience resulted in an overall rating of **Good** for ASRCA. In comparison, Swales had an overall Relevant rating of **Highly Relevant** rating based upon its demonstrated **Highly Relevant** experience in PWS Sections 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5, with a **Very Relevant** experience rating in PWS Section 3.2. The combination of **Excellent** performance and **Highly Relevant** experience resulted in an overall rating of **Excellent** for Swales. While ASRCA has demonstrated experience managing contracts of similar size, it has not demonstrated experience managing a contract of the content and complexity of TEAMS. Swales has demonstrated such experience by performing the SAMS contract, which is similar to TEAMS in size, content, and complexity.

Comparative Assessment Summary:

Compared to ASRCA, Swales has an overall **Very Good** technical proposal, superior past performance, and an evaluated price that is [redacted] higher than ASRCA. It is my conclusion that the additional value provided by Swales' superior proposed approaches in Mission Suitability, combined with Swales' superior level of highly relevant past

performance, is worth the additional [redacted] expenditure. Specifically, Swales received significant strengths for its clearly demonstrated superior technical approach and expertise to accomplish the wide breadth and variety of the PWS requirements, its comprehensive analysis and understanding of OCIs, its [redacted] its comprehensive understanding of potential safety considerations unique to the performance of the contract, and its excellent rating for past performance. I then considered ASRCA's significant strength in IT Security approach, significant weaknesses in an RTO, and the OCI and Safety and Health plans, good past performance rating, as well as the low confidence in ASRCA's probable cost. Swales' significant strengths when considered in combination with ASRCA's significant strength and significant weaknesses lead me to conclude that the Swales proposal provides a better overall value.

3. Swales compared to QSS:

Factor 1, "Mission Suitability": The Swales proposal for Factor 1, "Mission Suitability" is rated as **Very Good** while the QSS proposal is rated as **Good**.

Subfactor 1, "Understanding the Requirements and Technical Approach": The Swales proposal for Subfactor 1 is rated as **Excellent** while the QSS proposal is rated as **Good**. The Swales proposal offers substantially greater value to the Government than the QSS proposal offers under Mission Suitability Subfactor 1.

Areas of Superior Value in QSS' Proposal:
None.

Areas of Superior Value in Swales' Proposal:
Swales clearly demonstrated a superior technical approach and expertise to accomplish the wide breadth and variety of the PWS requirements. Swales presented representative examples for each PWS requirement. These examples included its approach for performing related research, understanding of relevant technologies, as well as an understanding of the multi-discipline array of design, analysis, and simulation tools. Swales also identified unique issues and risks associated with performing the requirements of the PWS within NASA LaRC's research environment, potential impacts of these risks, and mitigation approaches. These examples also demonstrated Swales' extensive expertise and experience in each of the typical work areas of the PWS. Swales' approach and expertise were considered to be significant strengths. In comparison, QSS received strengths for its clear understanding of and its technical approach to, as well as its expertise and experience to accomplish the PWS requirements; however QSS' proposal did not provide the level of depth and detail that Swales' proposal provided. While QSS does possess strengths in this Subfactor, Swales' comprehensive understanding of and extensive expertise in all of the areas of the PWS represents a superior value to the Government.

Swales received a significant strength for each of the five Representative Task Orders (RTOs). Swales' demonstration of its understanding of the RTO requirements, approach to unique and innovative problem resolutions, understanding of alternative solutions, and as well as having received a strength for consistently appropriate staffing and costing estimates was clearly superior to QSS' proposal. In comparison, QSS received strengths for its technical approach for RTO1, RTO2, and RTO3, with a corresponding weakness in the staffing plan and cost estimate for RTO1. QSS also received a weakness for RTO4 for an approach that failed to fully address the task requirements. QSS' approach included no specific methodology for technology assessment, particularly for incorporation of beyond the state-of-the-art technologies, and the level of detail was insufficient to determine if the cost estimate and staffing plan were appropriate. There was a clear difference in the quality and thoroughness of the responses to the RTOs between the two proposals. While QSS does possess strengths in this area, Swales' comprehensive understanding of and approach to the RTOs represents a superior value to the Government.

Areas with Similar Value:
None.

Swales therefore represents a substantially greater value to the Government in Subfactor 1 since its proposal provides a significantly superior overall understanding and approach to meeting the RFP requirements.

Subfactor 2, "Management and Staffing": The Swales proposal for Subfactor 2 is rated as **Very Good** while the QSS proposal is rated as **Good**. The Swales proposal offers greater value to the Government than the QSS proposal offers under Mission Suitability Subfactor 2.

Areas of Superior Value in QSS' Proposal:
None.

Areas of Superior Value in Swales' Proposal:
In MAS3, "Identification of Key Positions", Swales received a strength for its identification of essential key positions, including appropriate position descriptions and levels of experience and education. In comparison, QSS received a weakness for failing to identify the senior technical leads, who are responsible for directing all Task Order performance as key positions. Swales proposal is considered to represent a superior value to the Government.

In MAS4, "Teaming Arrangements", Swales received a significant strength for its integrated team, which provided depth and redundancy of skill sets and expertise as well as its plan [redacted]. In comparison, QSS received a weakness because its proposed contract work distribution among team members did not correlate with its proposed RTO staffing. Swales' proposal, which provided depth and redundancy of

skill sets and expertise, as well as its plan [redacted] to mitigate OCI issues, is considered to represent a superior value to the Government.
For MAS6, "Continuing Personnel Management", Swales received a significant strength for its comprehensive approach to retaining competent staff as well as responding to fluctuations in workload. Swales' proposal included employee retention initiatives, training, and recognition. In comparison, QSS received a strength for its approach to retaining competent staff. Swales' proposal with its comprehensive approach to retaining competent staff as well as responding to fluctuations in workload is considered to represent a superior value to the Government.

In MAS9, "Organizational Conflicts of Interest (OCI) Mitigation Plan", Swales received a significant strength for its comprehensive analysis and understanding of OCIs throughout its proposal. Swales received a corresponding weakness for not clearly addressing the required time periods specified in the RFP for protecting proprietary data and notifying the Contracting Officer of a potential OCI. In comparison, QSS received a significant weakness for its failure to analyze, mitigate, or eliminate the impact of potential OCIs with no corresponding strength. QSS' proposal demonstrates that it does not completely understand possible OCIs that might result from the award of this contract. Based upon the broad depth and breadth of the PWS, there is a significant potential for OCIs in the performance of the TEAMS contract. I am concerned that QSS' failure to identify, analyze, mitigate or eliminate the impact of potential OCIs will impact its ability to successfully perform the TEAMS contract. Swales addressed OCIs throughout its proposal, which indicates a high awareness of the risk of OCIs in the performance of the TEAMS contract. I believe that Swales' comprehensive analysis of possible OCIs and mitigation of those OCIs represents a superior value to the Government than QSS' proposal.

Swales also received a significant strength for MAS10, "Quality Management Systems", particularly due to its inclusion of a quality plan [redacted] QSS received a strength for MAS10 for its understanding as well as its ISO certification and CMMI rating, with a corresponding weakness for failing to include a plan for maintaining or improving its CMMI rating. While QSS possesses strengths in this area, [redacted] and therefore represents a superior value to the Government.

Areas with Similar Value:
QSS and Swales both received significant strengths in MAS1, "Management Approach" and MAS7, "Total Compensation Plan". Both also received strengths in MAS2, "Organizational Structure"; MAS5, "Subject Matter Experts"; and MAS8, "Electronic Task Order Management Control System(s)". All of these elements of Subfactor 2 were considered to be essentially equal in value.

Swales and QSS had several areas in Subfactor 2 which were considered to be essentially equal in value. However, Swales' superior proposal in the areas of Identification of Key Positions, Teaming Arrangements, Continuing Personnel Management, OCI and Quality Management Systems makes its proposal a greater value to the Government.

Subfactor 3, "Phase-In Plan": Both the Swales and the QSS proposals for Subfactor 3 are rated as **Very Good**. Both Offerors have significant strengths for their proposed Phase-In Plans, and the two plans are considered to be essentially equal in value. I therefore did not consider the Phase-In Plan to be a discriminating factor between Swales and QSS.

Subfactor 4, "Safety, Health and Security": Both the Swales and the QSS proposals for Subfactor 4 are rated as **Good**. While Swales has a significant strength in Safety and Health, QSS has a strength in this area. In addition, QSS received a strength for its understanding of IT Security issues while Swales received a weakness in this area. QSS and Swales both received strengths in SHS3, "Use of Foreign Sources", but QSS received a corresponding weakness for referencing the incorrect NASA Policy Regulation. QSS and Swales both received strengths for SHS4, "Export Control". After weighing all of these findings, I determined these two Offerors to be essentially equal in value to the Government under Mission Suitability Subfactor 4. I therefore did not consider the responses to Subfactor 4 to be a discriminating factor between Swales and QSS.

Factor 2 (Cost/Price Analysis):
Under Factor 2 (Cost/Price Analysis), QSS' evaluated cost of [redacted] for the total 5-year term of the contract is [redacted], or [redacted] lower than Swale's evaluated cost of [redacted] The probable cost confidence is high for Swales and moderate for QSS. This provides me with a high assurance that Swales' probable cost can be relied upon to predict its likely cost of performance, and a reasonable confidence that QSS' probable cost can be relied upon to predict its likely cost of performance. QSS had a net upward probable cost adjustment of [redacted] primarily for unrealistically low proposed unburdened labor rates for QSS and all of its subcontractors. Swales has a total downward probable cost adjustment of [redacted] primarily for the following three areas: labor costs, [redacted] computer costs, [redacted] and subcontractor costs to reflect adjustments made from analysis of each subcontractor, plus Swales' burdens, [redacted]

Factor 3 (Past Performance):
Under Factor 3 (Past Performance), QSS has an overall rating of **Good**, compared to Swales' overall rating of **Excellent**. Both QSS and Swales demonstrated exemplary performance on previous work (as reported by their customers) and received ratings of **Excellent**. QSS had an overall Relevance rating of **Relevant** based upon its demonstrated **Very Relevant** experience in PWS Sections 3.1, "Technical Management & Administrative"; **Relevant** experience in PWS Sections 3.3, "Engineering & Operations" and 3.5, "General Mission Support"; and **Somewhat Relevant** experience in PWS Sections 3.2, "Systems Analysis & Technology Integration" and 3.4, "Research

and Technology". The combination of **Excellent** performance and **Relevant** experience resulted in an overall rating of **Good** for QSS. In comparison, Swales had an overall relevant rating of **Highly Relevant** based upon its demonstrated **Highly Relevant** experience in PWS Sections 3.1, 3.3, 3.4, and 3.5, with a **Very Relevant** experience rating in PWS Section 3.2. The combination of **Excellent** performance and **Highly Relevant** experience resulted in an overall rating of **Excellent** for Swales. Both QSS and Swales have demonstrated experience in performing contracts similar to TEAMS in size, content, and complexity.

Comparative Assessment Summary:

Compared to QSS' overall **Good** technical proposal, **Good** past performance, and lower cost, Swales has an overall **Very Good** technical proposal, **Excellent** past performance, and an evaluated price that is [redacted] than QSS'. It is my conclusion that the additional value provided by Swales' superior proposed approaches in Mission Suitability, combined with Swales' superior level of relevant past performance, is worth the additional [redacted] expenditure. Specifically, Swales received significant strengths for its clearly demonstrated superior technical approach and expertise to accomplish the wide breadth and variety of the PWS requirements, its comprehensive analysis and understanding of OCIs, its [redacted] quality plan, its comprehensive understanding of potential safety considerations unique to the performance of the contract, and its excellent rating for past performance. Swales' significant strengths, when considered in combination with QSS' lower overall rated proposal, its strength in IT Security and its significant weakness in the OCI Mitigation Plan and lower rated past performance lead me to conclude that the Swales proposal provides a better overall value.

B. Source Selection Decision

I conducted an integrated assessment of each proposal in accordance with the RFP's evaluation factors, as detailed in the Comparative Assessment section above. A summary of my conclusions based on this integrated assessment, as well as my selection decision, are as follows:

Compared to all other Offerors regarding Factor 1 – Mission Suitability, Swales submitted the best overall technical proposal, with a proposal that was superior to the other Offerors. In one of the two most heavily weighted areas of Mission Suitability, Subfactor 1– Understanding the Requirements and Technical Approach, Swales submitted an Excellent proposal which clearly stood apart from the other proposals. In Subfactor 1, Technical Operations Plans, Swales clearly demonstrated a superior technical approach and expertise to accomplish the wide breadth and variety of the PWS requirements. In its Subfactor 1 – Technical Approach to Representative Task Orders, Swales received significant strengths for each task order, demonstrating its understanding of the RTO requirements, approach to unique and innovative problem resolutions, understanding of alternative solutions, and consistently appropriate staffing

and costing estimates. In Subfactor 2 – Management and Staffing, Swales submitted a Very Good proposal which was considered the best overall proposal. In Subfactor 3, Phase-In Plan, Swales submitted a strong proposal that was considered comparable to two of the Offerors and superior to one Offeror. In Subfactor 4 – Safety, Health, and Security, Swales submitted a Good proposal which was considered comparable to one of the Offerors and slightly better than the other two Offerors' proposals. Swales' proposal contained numerous Significant Strengths, numerous Strengths, no deficiencies, no significant weaknesses, and few weaknesses.

Compared to all other Offerors regarding Factor 2 – Cost/Price Analysis, Swales' evaluated price is reasonable, realistic, and in line with the Government's estimate. The confidence level for Swales' cost proposal is high.

Compared to all other Offerors regarding Factor 3 – Past Performance, Swales has demonstrated excellent past performance on work that is highly relevant to the TEAMS effort, resulting in an overall past performance rating that is significantly superior to all other Offerors.

In conclusion, having compared the strengths and weaknesses of all the proposals, it is clear that Swales Aerospace, Inc. offers a superior approach to Mission Suitability relative to all other Offerors. This superior approach, when combined with Swales' excellent and highly relevant past performance, and reasonable and realistic cost, provides the best value to the Government. Therefore, I direct the award of the Technology, Engineering, and Aerospace Mission Support (TEAMS) contract to Swales Aerospace, Inc.

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY:

L B Roe
Lesa B. Roe
Source Selection Authority

11/17/06
Date